

**REMARKS**

Claims 5-7, 14-18, 31, 33-35, 38 and 41-48 are pending in the application.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for allowing claims 5, 7, 15, 18, 31, 35, 41 and 42.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) - Herman**

Claims 6, 16, 33, 38 and 43-48 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Herman (U.S. Patent Number 6,674,898). The rejection is respectfully traversed. First, Applicants incorporate by reference the arguments for patentability of these claims that were made in the November 2, 2006 Amendment.

In addition, in response to the Examiner's Response, Applicants have the following comments. In the Office Action, the Examiner argues that Herman discloses a method of performing color correction on selected scenes in order to maintain a constant color from scene shot to scene shot in the video image. That is, the Herman method performs color correction so that an objective color may become constant during the period when a certain object is displayed. Therefore, among the colors compared in color correction, one is the color of a picture on a display and the other is the color defined previously.

However, in the claimed invention, when switching of scene occurs, new color correction is performed by resetting color correction (updating of the correction amount) after scene switching. What is detected is the change of the image quality in a scene. The feature amounts of a certain frame and the other frame are used for detection of change of the image quality. In summary, what is compared in the color correction of the claimed invention is the color between images displayed. Therefore, since the subjects compared in Herman and the claimed invention are different, Herman does not anticipate the claims.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) - Herman**

Claims 14, 17 and 34 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Herman. The rejection is respectfully traversed. First, Applicants incorporate by reference the arguments for patentability of these claims that were made in the November 2, 2006 Amendment.

As discussed above, Herman fails to teach or suggest Applicants' claimed invention as recited in respective independent claims 6, 16 and 33. Applicants' claims 14, 17 and 34 are dependent claims including all of the elements of independent claims 6, 16 and 33, respectively, which as established above, distinguish over Herman.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Carl J. Pellegrini  
Registration No. 40,766

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: April 5, 2007